UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/021,340	12/13/2001	Shell S. Simpson	10008222-1	6165

7590 07/24/2007

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
MURPHY, DILLON J	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/24/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 10/021,340
Filing Date: December 13, 2001
Appellant(s): SIMPSON ET AL.

David R. Risley
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed March 30, 2007 appealing from the Office action mailed November 17, 2006.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

5,809,167	Al-Hussein	9-1998
6,268,927	Lo et al.	7-2001

6,636,891	LeClair et al.	10-2003
6,910,179	Pennell et al.	6-2005

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 11-13, 15, 19, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Al-Hussein (US 5,809,167) in view of Lo et al. (US 6268927), hereafter Al-Hussein and Lo.

Regarding claim 11, Al-Hussein teaches a method practiced by a printer (Al-Hussein, fig 3, printer #26. Also see col 5, ln 27-32, printer #26 for printing. Also see col 5, ln 53-67, for printing a document) for printing a document comprising the steps of accessing document imaging data from at least one store via a network with the printer (Al-Hussein, col 6, ln 12-16, files are accessed from network disk. Additionally, the actions are performed by the printer itself, which comprises a general purpose computer, col 5, ln 53-60. Thus, any actions performed on any general purpose computer may be performed within the personal imaging computer system (PICS) of Al-Hussein), retrieving the document imaging data from the at least one store, and printing the document imaging data with the printer (Al-Hussein, col 6, ln 22-25, method comprises retrieving the document image and associated text file and printing at a printer). Al-Hussein does not disclose expressly the method of merging and printing form data, although form data falls under the category of a document. Lo teaches a method practiced by a printer for printing a form comprising merging the retrieved form imaging data with the already stored static form data on the printer to generate a

completed form (Lo, col 5, ln 64-col 6, ln 2, wherein user data is received by the printer and the data is overlaid, i.e. merged, on the EPS form image, i.e. static form data. Also see figure 3 for an overview of receiving dynamic data and merging received data with static data. In col 5, ln 38-40, static form data is stored on the storage device, and in col 5, ln 20-25, printer may include an internal mass storage device, #3 of fig 3), and printing the form imaging data along with the already stored static form data together as a hard copy form (Lo, fig 3, received data, i.e. user data, and already stored static form data, i.e. form in storage #3, are printed together as composite image "form + data". Also see col 5, ln 64-col 6, ln 2), such that printing a hard copy form is possible without the need to send the static form data to the printer and such that a copy of the static form data need only be stored on the printer (Lo, col 6, ln 60-67, only dynamic data is sent. In col 11, ln 41-42, and Table 1, dynamic data is downloaded to printer without static data showing time savings. Also see col 12, ln 15-17, wherein form need only be stored on the mass storage device, previously shown to be incorporated into printer).

Al-Hussein and Lo are combinable because they are in the same field of endeavor of printing systems and data control. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method of merging the retrieved form imaging data with the already stored static form data on the printer of Lo, and printing the form such that printing a hard copy is possible without the need to send the static form data to the printer with the methods of Al-Hussein comprising accessing, retrieving, and printing document data by the printer. The motivation for doing so would have been to access files for printing remotely, as well as

to retrieve a document image and text file for later printing (Al-Hussein, col 3, ln 51-55). Additionally, the suggestion for accessing and retrieving files with the printer was given by Lo in col 5, ln 31-35, teaching a utility stored in the printer to facilitate file downloading and file management procedures. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Lo with Al-Hussein to obtain the invention as specified in claim 11.

Regarding claim 12, which depends from claim 11, the combination of Al-Hussein and Lo further teaches a method wherein the at least one store comprises a graphic store and a composition store (Al-Hussein, col 7, ln 39-51, images and text are stored in memory).

Regarding claim 13, which depends from claim 11, the combination of Al-Hussein and Lo further teaches a method wherein the at least one store is associated with an imaging service stored on the printer that is configured to facilitate form completion (Al-Hussein, col 7, ln 39-51, CPU associated with imaging service controls program instruction sequences which manipulate document images. Word processor, image processing, and spreadsheet processing, i.e. programs for form processing, are stored in the PICS of Al-Hussein, col 5, ln 60-67).

Regarding claim 15, which depends from claim 11, the combination of Al-Hussein and Lo further teaches a method wherein accessing form imaging data comprises accessing imaging data through use of an imaging extension (Al-Hussein, col 7, ln 39-51, CPU associated with imaging service controls program instruction sequences which access and manipulate document images. Program of Al-Hussein provides generating and mapping of client instructions).

Regarding claim 19, the combination of Al-Hussein and Lo teaches a system stored on a printer for printing a form, the system comprising:

Means provided on the printer for accessing form imaging data form at least one store via a network (Al-Hussein, col 6, ln 12-16, files are accessed from network disk. Files are stored in server #41 on network disk #42, while being accessed via network #31 in figure 4. Also see Lo, fig 3, wherein user data is received from a network computer, col 5, ln 8-11);

Means for merging the retrieved form imaging data with static form data already stored of the printer to generate a completed form (Lo, col 5, ln 64-col 6, ln 2, wherein user data is received by the printer and the data is overlaid, i.e. merged, on the EPS form image, i.e. static form data. Also see figure 3 for an overview of receiving dynamic data and merging received data with static data. In col 5, ln 38-40, static form data is stored on the storage device, and in col 5, ln 20-25, printer may include an internal mass storage device, #3 of fig 3); and

Means for printing the form imaging data along with the already stored static form data together as a hard copy form (Lo, fig 3, received data, i.e. user data, and already stored static form data, i.e. form in storage #3, are printed together as composite image "form + data". Also see col 5, ln 64-col 6, ln 2),

Wherein printing a hard copy form is possible with the system without the need to send the static form data to the printer and wherein a copy of the static form data need only be stored on the printer (Lo, col 6, ln 60-67, only dynamic data is sent. In col 11, ln 41-42, and Table 1, dynamic data is downloaded to printer without static data showing

time savings. Also see col 12, ln 15-17, wherein form need only be stored on the mass storage device, previously shown to be incorporated into printer).

Regarding claim 24, the combination of Al-Hussein and Lo further teaches a printer, comprising:

Memory (Al-Hussein, in figure 5, Personal Imagining Computer System #20, "PICS," comprises CPU #60, RAM Memory #79, ROM #77, and disk storage #75 for storing and executing instructions for image processing, col 7, ln 61-67 and col 8, ln 1-9), including logic configured to:

Access form imaging data (As explained in the rejection of claim 11, the document of Al-Hussein covers the forms as taught by Lo) from at least one store via a network (Al-Hussein, col 6, ln 12-16, files are accessed from network disk. Files are stored in server #41 on network disk #42, while being accessed via network #31 in figure 4. Also see Lo, fig 3, wherein user data is received from a network computer, col 5, ln 8-11),

Retrieve the form imaging data, merge the received data with static form data already stored on the printer to generate a completed form (Lo, col 5, ln 64-col 6, ln 2, wherein user data is received by the printer and the data is overlaid, i.e. merged, on the EPS form image, i.e. static form data. Also see figure 3 for an overview of receiving dynamic data and merging received data with static data. In col 5, ln 38-40, static form data is stored on the storage device, and in col 5, ln 20-25, printer may include an internal mass storage device, #3 of fig 3), and print the form imaging data along with the already stored static form data as a hard copy form (Al-Hussein, col 6, ln 22-25, method

comprises retrieving the document image and associated text file and printing at a printer. Printer is shown as printer, #45, in figure 4. See also Lo, fig 3, wherein received data, i.e. user data, and already stored static form data, i.e. form in storage #3, are printed together as composite image "form + data". Also see col 5, ln 64-col 6, ln 2), wherein printing a hard copy form is possible with the printer without the need to sent the static form data to the printer and wherein a copy of the static form data need only be stored on the printer (Lo, col 6, ln 60-67, only dynamic data is sent. In col 11, ln 41-42, and Table 1, dynamic data is downloaded to printer without static data showing time savings. Also see col 12, ln 15-17, wherein form need only be stored on the mass storage device, previously shown to be incorporated into printer).

Regarding claim 25, which depends from claim 24, the combination of Al-Hussein and Lo further teaches a printer wherein the logic comprises a network-based printing service (Al-Hussein, figure 4, printers #45, #20, and #56 are connected to LANs #32 and #46, respectively).

Claims 14, 16-18, 20-23, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Al-Hussein in view of Lo and further in view of LeClair et al. (US 6636891) and further in view of Pennell et al. (US 6910179).

Regarding claim 14, which depends from claim 13, the combination of Al-Hussein and Lo teaches a method practiced by a printer for printing a form comprising accessing form image data, retrieving the form imaging data, merging the retrieved form imaging data with already stored static form data, and printing the form imaging data along with

the already stored static form data as a hard copy, such that printing the hard copy is possible without the need to send the static data to the printer, wherein at least one store is associated with an imaging service stored on the printer. Although the combination of Al-Hussein and Lo teaches a method wherein the PICS is a general purpose computer combined with a printer connected to a network, the combination does not disclose expressly wherein the imaging service comprises a network-based form processing service hosted by the printer. LeClair, however, teaches a method of hosting a network-based imaging service hosted by a printer (LeClair, col 7, ln 55-59, printer hosts processing in embedded server, and col 8, ln 1-3, user invokes a browser connected to internet to submit and receive information).

Al-Hussein, Lo and LeClair are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor of printing systems and data control. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method of LeClair comprising hosting a network based imaging service hosted by a printer with the method of Al-Hussein and Lo comprising accessing form image data, retrieving the form imaging data, merging the retrieved form imaging data with already stored static form data, and printing the form imaging data along with the already stored static form data as a hard copy, such that printing the hard copy is possible without the need to send the static data to the printer, wherein at least one store is associated with an imaging service stored on the printer. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow multiple computer workstations or personal computers to share input and output devices (LeClair, col 1, ln 17-20).

The combination of Al-Hussein, Lo, and LeClair teaches a method practiced by a printer for generating a form comprising accessing form image data, retrieving the form imaging data, merging the retrieved form imaging data with already stored static form data, and printing the form imaging data along with the already stored static form data as a hard copy, such that printing the hard copy is possible without the need to send the static data to the printer, wherein at least one store is associated with an imaging service stored on the printer, and wherein the imaging service comprises a network-based processing service hosted by the printer. The combination of Al-Hussein, Lo and LeClair does not disclose expressly a method wherein the form processing is web-based. Pennell, however, teaches a method for inputting form data via a browser (Pennell, col 2, ln 11-12).

Al-Hussein, Lo, LeClair, and Pennell are combinable because they are from a similar field of endeavor of data processing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method of Pennell comprising web-based form processing with the combination of Al-Hussein, Lo, and LeClair comprising a method practiced by a printer for generating a form comprising accessing form image data, retrieving the form imaging data, merging the retrieved form imaging data with already stored static form data, and printing the form imaging data along with the already stored static form data as a hard copy, such that printing the hard copy is possible without the need to send the static data to the printer, wherein at least one store is associated with an imaging service stored on the printer, and wherein the imaging service comprises a network-based processing service hosted by the printer.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow any user regardless of their location to access the form processing features as taught by the combination of Al-Hussein, Lo, and LeClair. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Pennell with the combination of Al-Hussein, Lo, and LeClair to obtain the invention as specified in claim 14.

Regarding claim 16, which depends from claim 15, the combination of Al-Hussein, Lo, LeClair, and Pennell teaches a method practiced by a printer for printing a form, wherein the imaging extension comprises part of a user browser (LeClair, col 8, ln 1-3, printing commands are issued from a browser over the internet. Also see Pennell, fig 4, wherein the browser is used for form processing. It is well known that a browser as taught by Pennell and LeClair comprises at least one imaging extension such as WinSock API).

Regarding claim 17, which depends from claim 15, the combination of Al-Hussein, Lo, LeClair and Pennell teaches a method practiced by a printer for printing a form wherein the imaging extension comprises part of a network-based printing service hosted by the printer (LeClair, col 7, ln 57-65, instructions issued to retrieve documents are sent by browser, col 8, ln 1-3, which is hosted by printer, in network connected to printer figure 3, I/O device #350 connected to network #300, browser is viewed in display #322, connected to server #310 and network. Also see col 9, ln 30-34 of LeClair, wherein a print request printing the forms as taught by Lo, may be received by the network based printer. It is well known in the art that a browser as taught by Pennell and LeClair comprises at least one imaging extension such as WinSock API).

Regarding claim 18, which depends from claim 17, the combination of Al-Hussein, Lo, LeClair, and Pennell teaches a method wherein the printing service is hosted by an embedded server of the printer (LeClair, col 7, ln 55-59, printer hosts processing in embedded server. Processing occurs in server in printer to process images comprising documents and forms).

Regarding claim 20, which depends from claim 19, the combination of Al-Hussein, Lo, LeClair, and Pennell teaches a system stored on a printer for printing a form wherein the means for accessing form imaging data comprises an imaging extension (Al-Hussein, col 7, ln 39-51, CPU associated with imaging service controls program instruction sequences which access and manipulate document images. In figure 5, disk #75, where image and text files are stored, is interfaced with SCSI interface #76 to computer bus #61. Also see, LeClair, col 8, ln 1-3, printing commands are issued from a browser over the Internet. Also see Pennell, fig 4, wherein the browser is used for form processing. It is well known that a browser as taught by Pennell and LeClair comprises at least one imaging extension such as WinSock API).

Regarding claim 21, which depends from claim 20, the combination of Al-Hussein, Lo, LeClair, and Pennell teaches a system stored on a printer for printing a form wherein the imaging extension comprises part of a user browser (LeClair, col 8, ln 1-3, printing commands are issued from a browser over the internet. Also see Pennell, fig 4, wherein the browser is used for form processing. It is well known in the art that a browser as taught by Pennell and LeClair comprises at least one imaging extension such as WinSock API).

Regarding claim 22, which depends from claim 20, the combination of Al-Hussein, Lo, LeClair, and Pennell teaches a system stored on a printer for printing a form wherein the imaging extension comprises part of a network-based printing service hosted by the printer (LeClair, col 7, ln 57-65, instructions issued to retrieve documents are sent by browser, col 8, ln 1-3, in network connected to printer (figure 3), I/O device #350 connected to network #300, browser is viewed in display #322, connected to server #310 and network. Embedded server of LeClair may host form process website as taught by Pennell. Additionally, it is well known in the art that a browser as taught by Pennell and LeClair comprises at least one imaging extension such as WinSock API).

Regarding claim 23, which depends from claim 22, the combination of Al-Hussein, Lo, LeClair, and Pennell teaches a system stored on a printer for printing a form wherein the printing service is hosted by an embedded server of the printer (LeClair, col 7, ln 57-65, instructions issued to retrieve documents are sent by browser, col 8, ln 1-3, which is hosted by printer, in network connected to printer figure 3, I/O device #350 connected to network #300, browser is viewed in display #322, connected to server #310 and network. Also see col 9, ln 30-34 of LeClair, wherein a print request printing the forms as taught by Lo, may be received by the network based printer. It is well known in the art that a browser as taught by Pennell and LeClair comprises at least one imaging extension such as WinSock API).

Regarding claim 26, which depends from claim 24, the combination of Al-Hussein, Lo, LeClair, and Pennell further teaches a printer wherein the logic comprises an imaging extension that is configured to access the at least one store (Al-Hussein, col

8, ln 67 and continuing to col 9, ln 1-8, program of PICS includes logic for an imaging extension configured to access at least one store, i.e. the program has capabilities to create, store, and access text files and associated image files from various storage media. Also see LeClair, col 8, ln 1-3, printing commands are issued from a browser over the internet. Also see Pennell, fig 4, wherein the browser is used for form processing. It is well known in the art that a browser as taught by Pennell and LeClair comprises at least one imaging extension such as WinSock API).

Regarding claim 27, which depends from claim 24, the combination of Al-Hussein, Lo, LeClair, and Pennell teaches a printing system further comprising an embedded server (LeClair, col 7, ln 55-59, printer comprises an embedded server. In figure 3, server #310 may be embedded in I/O device #350. Processing occurs in server in printer to process images comprising documents and forms).

(10) Response to Argument

Claims 11-13 and 15

Appellant, on page 9, lines 4-10, argues that the PICS equipment #20 of Al-Hussein is not a printer.

In response: Al-Hussein, at column 5, lines 53-67, discloses the Personal Imaging Computer System, or "PICS", as a stand-alone device that is capable of performing image processing, scanning documents, creating text files, and printing out document images. Additionally, other information processing techniques may be carried out such as word processing and spreadsheet processing according to the

software loaded into the PICS equipment #20. In figure 3, the printer section #26 is disclosed, while in column 6, lines 62 to column 7, lines 1-5, and in figure 5, a printer interface #66 is disclosed for interfacing with printer #26. These teachings clearly recite the PICS functionality as a printer.

Al-Hussein continues with the description of the PICS in a networking environment in column 6, lines 1-25, for example. In this section, the PICS equipment #20 is disclosed as providing the capabilities described in column 5, lines 53-67, i.e. image processing, word processing, scanning and printing, to the computerized network users. Thus, the capabilities in column 6, lines 1-25 are an extension of the capabilities already found in the PICS equipment. In column 6, lines 16-25, Al-Hussein describes a case of printing on one of printers #45, shown in figure 4. Based upon the previously described teachings of Al-Hussein and the additional knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, printers #45 or printers #56 may be used to print on a network instead of a local printer #26 found in the PICS equipment #20. Often times a network printer of superior quality than a local printer, and network printers are used as an alternative. The use of the printer #45 is merely illustrative of the PICS equipment's #20 own capabilities.

On page 9, lines 18-23 and page 10, lines 1-3, Appellant argues the illustration shown in figure 3 explicitly shows a typical facsimile machine. Additionally, Appellant states Al-Hussein does not describe transmitting print-ready document from an application, such as Microsoft Word, to the PICS equipment #20 for printing. The Examiner disagrees with the Appellants narrow reading of the Al-Hussein disclosure

and for the narrow test proposed to determine if an imaging device is a printer. As has been previously shown, the PICS equipment #20 of Al-Hussein functions as a printer as either a stand-alone unit or in a network environment, and directly reads on a printer.

On page 10, lines 12-22 and page 11, lines 1-13, Appellant argues that Al-Hussein fails to teach "accessing form imaging data from at least one store via a network" and "retrieving the form image data from the at least one store". The Examiner respectfully disagrees, citing column 6, lines 16-25 which states:

> ...operators at one of the workstations 40 can scan in a document using PICS equipment 20, segmentation-process and recognition-process the document image so as to obtain a text file corresponding to text areas of the document, store the document image and associated text file on network disk 42, retrieve the document image and its associated text file for manipulation, if desired, at workstation 40, and print out the original or manipulated document image and text file on one of printers 45.

The above passage illustrates how a document may be scanned in and stored on a network disk #42. Additionally, in column 11, lines 11-18, a document may be input remotely via means such as a telephone line, a local area network, or a wide area network, for example. The method of inputting a document is not at issue here. The fact that the document may be stored on network disk #42 and accessed later is at issue. The examiner points to fig 7, wherein the display #35 is explicitly shown to access and retrieve data. Additionally, at column 10, lines 44-55, Al-Hussein discloses accessing and retrieving image data via a network store. Column 10, lines 42-55 states:

> Storage may be to disk 75, but more preferably the document image and its associated text file are stored on one of network disks 42 or 54 as part of a searchable database.
> Thus, as shown in step S805, the document image may be retrieved, for example, in response to query-based searches of the text file. More particularly, based on keyword searches or other searches performed in response to operator queries, text files in the database are searched so as to identify text files which satisfy operator entered queries. Once such text files are identified, associated document images are retrieved and the document images are presented to the operator in desired form, such as by display or by printing.

The above cited passage clearly teaches accessing and retrieving document data as claimed by the Appellant in claim 11. The above process is disclosed as being performed by the PICS equipment in column 10, lines 10-15, which states the actions are performed by CPU #60 in PICS equipment #20 of figure 5. Thus, Al-Hussein clearly teaches Appellant's accessing and retrieving contrary to Appellant's assertions on page 12, lines 11-19.

On page 12, lines 21-22 and page 13, lines 1-15, Appellant argues the combination of Al-Hussein and Lo is improper, stating one of ordinary skill in the art would not think to attribute printer functionalities to Al-Hussein's PICS equipment #20. The examiner respectfully disagrees. As explained above, the PICS equipment #20 is a printer, and accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine functions of printers. However, assuming *arguendo*, if the PICS equipment #20 is considered a facsimile machine, it still would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the functions of the PICS equipment #20 with the

printer of Lo. A facsimile is at its most basic a printer with a sending and receiving unit. Therefore, it is obvious to combine functions of a printer and facsimile machine. Appellant recognizes the obviousness of combining features of a printer and facsimile machine by disclosing their equivalence in Appellant's disclosure at page 5, lines 15-20, which states:

> Although the term "printing device" is used herein, it is to be understood that the disclosure is not limited to any particular type of device that provides this functionality. Accordingly, the term is intended to include any appliance or printing device (*e.g.,* printer, photocopier, facsimile machine, multifunctional peripheral (MFP), *etc.*) that either inherently provides this functionality or which provides it when a suitable accessory is used in conjunction therewith.

Additionally, Appellant attacks the Al-Hussein reference for by alleging the PICS equipment #20 is not a printer. Although the Examiner disagrees with Appellant's arguments as explained above, the Examiner additionally notes one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Claims 19, 24 and 25

On page 13, lines 17-21 and page 14, lines 1-2, Appellant argues there is no motivation to a person having ordinary skill in the art to add Lo's form processing and printing functionalities to Al-Hussein's PICS equipment #20. On page 14, lines 3-9, Appellant argues neither Al-Hussein for Lo teaches or suggests a printer comprising:

> "logic configured to access form imaging data format least one store via a network, retrieve the form imaging data, merge the received data with static form data already stored on printer to generate a completed form, and print the form imaging data along with the already stored static form data together as a hard copy form"

as claimed in claim 24. The examiner respectfully disagrees, and recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, both Al-Hussein's equipment and Lo's equipment are printers. The motivation for combining the Al-Hussein and Lo would have been to access files for printing remotely, as well as to retrieve a document image and text file for later printing (Al-Hussein, col 3, ln 51-55). Additionally, the suggestion for accessing and retrieving files with the printer was given by Lo in col 5, ln 31-35, teaching a utility stored in the printer to facilitate file downloading and file management procedures.

Claims 14, 16-18, 20-23, 26 and 27

On page 14, lines 20-22 and page 15, lines 1-10, Appellant argues the LeClair reference does not teach an "imaging extension" of a network printing service "hosted by the printer" "accessing" imaging data "from at least one store via a network". The Examiner respectfully disagrees, citing LeClair at column 5, lines 1-3, column 7, lines 7-

15, and column 7, lines 55—59, wherein an output device such as a printer may comprise an embedded web server. This web server hosts a HTTP service which may be accessed via a browser and the internet, column 8, lines 1-3 and column 9, lines 3-6. Given the broad limitation of the term "imaging extension", the browser can be broadly interpreted to read on an imaging extension. Additionally, the Pennell reference teaches using a browser such as Internet Explorer, which uses a network software and specification such as WinSock API to provide a standard interface. This reads on an "imaging extension" as claimed as well as Appellant's definition of an imaging extension on page 17, lines 17-19 of the specification which states: "The imaging extension 710 typically is implement as one or more application programming instructions (APIs) that, preferably, act as interfaces in accordance with a system-wide standard".

On page 15, lines 11-12, Appellant addresses claims 21, 22, and 23 by referring to the discussion of claims 16, 17 and 18, respectively. In response, the Examiner respectfully addresses claims 21, 22 and 23 by also referring to claims 16, 17 and 18, respectively.

On page 15, lines 13-14, Appellant addresses claim 27 by referring to the discussion of claims 17 and 18, respectively. In response, the Examiner respectfully addresses claim 27 by also referring to claims 17 and 18, respectively.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Dillon Murphy

Dillon Murphy

Conferees:

Aung Moe

Supervisory Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2625

A. M.

AUNG S. MOE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
7/20/07

David Moore

David Moore

Supervisory Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2625

DAVID MOORE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600